

**Tricia Wang (CA Bar No: 178473)**  
LAW OFFICE OF TRICIA WANG  
39159 Paseo Padre Parkway, Suite 205  
Fremont, CA 94538  
Telephone: (510) 791-0232  
Fax: (510) 791-5609

Attorney for Petitioner: Chen, Xiling

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA**

Xiling CHEN

Plaintiff,

vs.

Alberto Gonzales, Attorney General of the  
United States; Michael Chertoff, Secretary of the  
Department of Homeland Security; Emilio Gonzalez  
Director of United States Citizenship & Immigration  
Services; Robert Mueller, Director of the Federal  
Bureau of Investigations; Gerard Heinauer,  
Director of the Nebraska Service Center

Defendants

Case No. C 07-4698 JW

PETITIONER'S RENOTICE OF  
MOTION AND MOTION FOR  
SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Date: April 21, 2008  
Time: 9:00 am  
Courtroom 8, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor

1 TO RESPONDENTS AND THEIR ATTORNEY OF RECORD:  
2

3 Notice is hereby given that on April 21, 2008 at 9:00 a.m., or as soon thereafter as  
4 counsel may be heard by the above-entitled Court, located at 280 South 1<sup>st</sup> Street, San Jose,  
5 CA 95113, the above-referenced Plaintiff will and hereby do move the Court for summary  
6 judgment on the ground that there is no genuine issue of material fact in dispute and that the  
7 moving party is entitled to a judgment as a matter of law.

8 This motion is based upon this Notice of Motion and Motion, all pleadings and papers  
9 on file in this action, and upon such other matters as may be presented to the Court at the  
10 time of the hearing.  
11  
12  
13

14 Dated: March 3, 2008

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/

Tricia Wang  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1       **I. INTRODUCTION**

2               Petitioner filed a petition for writ of mandamus and complaint under the  
3       Administrative Procedures Act (“APA”) because Respondents have failed to  
4       adjudicate her application for permanent residency in a “reasonable time.” 5 U.S.C. §  
5       555(b). Petitioner’s husband Zhenru Ding has an I-140 Immigration Petition filed on  
6       his behalf and the petition was approved with a priority date of December 21, 2001.  
7       Petitioner applied for permanent residency as a derivative applicant on April 19,  
8       2004. The application has now been pending for **over three years and nine months**.

9               Summary judgment should be granted because there is no dispute as to the  
10       length of time that Petitioner’s application has been pending, and because  
11       Respondents owe a statutory and regulatory duty to adjudicate Petitioner’s  
12       application. *Patel v. Reno*, 134 F.3d 929, 931 (9 Cir. 1997); *Azurin v. Von Raab*, 803  
13       F.2d 993, 995 (9th Cir.1986). As such, Petitioner’s application must be adjudicated  
14       within a “reasonable time.” 5 U.S.C. § 555(b). Period of three years and nine months  
15       is far beyond any “reasonable time” period. As such, Petitioner requests that the  
16       Court grant her Motion for Summary Judgment and order that Respondents adjudicate  
17       her application for permanent residency within ten (10) days of the Court’s order.

18       **II. STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED FACTS**

19               Petitioner and her husband Zhenru Ding are both native and citizen of the  
20       People’s Republic of China. Zhenru Ding is a software engineer and his employer  
21       started the green card application for him on December 21, 2001. Zhenru Ding  
22       applied for adjustment of status on April 19, 2004. His application was approved and  
23       he became a permanent resident on January 19, 2005. Petitioner Xiling Chen applied  
24       for adjustment of status as a derivative applicant together with her husband and on the  
25       same day, however her application is still pending, now three years after her husband  
26       became a permanent resident of the United States.

27               Since the petitioner’s filing of her adjustment of status application on April 19,  
28       2004, USCIS has not provided her with any information regarding the status of her  
      application, except to say that they are awaiting FBI name checks. The petitioner has

1 to apply for H1B extension or employment authorization and Advance Parole  
 2 documents from the USCIS year after year in order to be legally employed and travel  
 3 abroad. Petitioner's application for adjustment of status could have been approved on  
 4 or about the same time as her husband's application, if not for the delay on her name  
 5 check. Since the approval of her husband's application in January 2005 and up to  
 6 now, Petitioner has to file for her H1B extension THREE times, one in October 2005,  
 7 one in February 2007 and the last one in December 2007, because her current H1B is  
 8 expiring on March 1, 2008. Copies of the approval notices were submitted with the  
 9 original complaint. Copy of the receipt notice for the most recent filing is attached as  
 10 Exhibit 1. All these have placed a tremendous burden both emotionally and  
 financially to the Petitioner's life.

11 On September 12, 2007, after waiting more than three years for a decision  
 12 from the USCIS, Petitioner filed this action seeking an order directing USCIS to  
 13 adjudicate her application for permanent residency.

### 14 **III. ARGUMENT**

15  
 16 Summary judgment is proper when the pleadings, discovery and affidavits show that  
 17 there is "no genuine issue as to any material fact and that the moving party is entitled to  
 18 judgment as a matter of law." Fed.R.Civ.P. 56(c). The moving party for summary judgment  
 19 bears the burden of identifying those portions of the pleadings, discovery and affidavits that  
 20 demonstrate the absence of a genuine issue of material fact. Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477  
 21 U.S. 317, 323, 106 S.Ct. 2548 (1986).

22 Petitioner moves that this Court grant summary judgment in her favor because  
 23 Respondents have a statutory duty to adjudicate her pending application for adjustment of  
 24 status, and they have failed to act on that duty in a reasonable time.

#### 25 **A. MANDAMUS IS APPROPRIATE BECAUSE RESPONDENTS HAVE A NON-** 26 **DISCRETIONARY DUTY TO ACT**

27 The Mandamus Act provides that, "[t]he district courts shall have original  
 28 jurisdiction of any action in the nature of mandamus to compel an officer or employee

1 of the United States or any agency thereof to perform a duty owed to the plaintiff.” 28  
 2 U.S.C. §1361. Mandamus is a remedy available to compel a federal official to  
 3 perform a duty if: (1) the individual’s claim is clear and certain; (2) the official’s duty  
 4 is nondiscretionary, ministerial, and so plainly prescribed as to be free from doubt,  
 5 and (3) no other adequate remedy is available. Patel v. Reno, 134 F.3d 929, 931 (9<sup>th</sup>  
 6 Cir. 1997); Azurin v. Von Raab, 803 F.2d 993, 995 (9th Cir.1986). Petitioner meets  
 7 the above test as her claim is clear and certain, Respondents have a duty to adjudicate  
 8 her application for permanent residency; and no other adequate remedy is available.

9  
 10 The adjudication process for adjustment of status applications is codified at 8  
 11 C.F.R. § 245 *et seq.* and these regulations create a mandatory, non-discretionary duty  
 12 to adjudicate such applications. Specifically, Section 245.2 of the Code of Federal  
 13 Regulations provides that “[t]he applicant *shall* be notified of the decision of the  
 14 director and, if the application is denied, the reasons for the denial” (emphasis added).  
 15 “By using the phrase of legal art ‘shall,’ Congress order the executive branch to make  
 16 decisions on these applications.” Razaq v. Poulos, NO. C 26-2461 (N.D.Ca. 2007).

17 The statutory and regulatory texts create a non-discretionary duty to adjudicate  
 18 the Petitioner’s adjustment of status application. The Supreme Court made clear that the  
 19 use of the term “shall” constitutes a mandatory duty upon the subject of the command.  
 20 Forest Guardians v. Babbitt, 164 F.3d 1261, 1268 -1269 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1998) citing United  
 21 States v. Monsanto, 491 U.S. 600, 607, 109 S.Ct. 2657 (1989) (by using “shall” in civil  
 22 forfeiture statute, “Congress could not have chosen stronger words to express its intent  
 23 that forfeiture be mandatory in cases where the statute applied”); Pierce v. Underwood,  
 24 487 U.S. 552, 569-70 (1988) (Congress’ use of “shall” in a housing subsidy statute  
 25 constitutes “mandatory language”). See also Patel v. Reno, 134 F.3d 929, 933 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir.  
 26 1997) (agency has a duty to act on pending visa petition based on the requirements of the  
 27 Immigration and Nationality Act and its implementing regulations); Aboushaban v.  
 28 Mueller \_\_ F. Supp. 2d. — 2006 WL 3041086, 1-2 (N.D.Cal. Oct. 24, 2006) (agency had  
 a duty to adjudicate application for adjustment of status); Yu v. Brown, 36 F.Supp.2d

1 922, 931-32 (D.N.M. 1999) (holding that the INS owed plaintiff a duty to process her  
2 application for a change of her status to permanent resident).

3 B. PETITIONER’S APPLICATION HAS BEEN DELAYED FOR AN  
4 UNREASONABLE AMOUNT OF TIME

5 The Administrative Procedure Act provides that “[w]ith due regard for the  
6 convenience and necessity of the parties or their representatives and within a  
7 reasonable time, each agency shall proceed to conclude a matter presented to it...” 5  
8 U.S.C. §555(b). In addition, the Administrative Procedures Act (“APA”) further  
9 provides that the federal courts “shall compel agency action unlawfully withheld or  
10 unreasonably delayed...” 5 U.S.C. § 706(1). As the Tenth Circuit pointed out, the  
11 APA prohibits both agency action unlawfully withheld and agency action  
12 unreasonably delayed. Forest Guardians v. Babbitt, 164 F.3d 1261, 1269 (10<sup>th</sup>  
13 Cir.1998). Thus, the APA gives rise to a legally enforceable right to the completion of  
14 administrative agency action within a reasonable time, not merely a right to have the  
15 agency take some action at all.” Id.; Deering Milliken, Inc. v. Johnston, 295 F.2d 856,  
16 861 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir.1961). Although the Immigration and Nationality Act provides no discrete  
17 time period in which the agency must act, courts have concluded that the APA  
18 imposes a “reasonable time” constraint in such cases. See e.g. Yu v. Brown, 36  
19 F.Supp.2d 922, 928-32 (D.N.M.1999), (applying the APA’s reasonable requirement to  
20 similar regulatory provisions); Kim v. Ashcroft, 340 F. Supp 2d 384, 39 1-92  
21 (S.D.N.Y.2004)(same).

22  
23 Petitioner’s adjustment of status application has been pending for over three  
24 years and nine months. The delay Petitioner has experienced is entirely unreasonable.  
25 See Galvez v. Howerton, 503 F.Supp. 35 at 39 (C.D.Cal.1980) (delay of six months  
26 unreasonable); Paunescu v. INS, 76 F.Supp.2d 896 at 901 and 902 (N.D.Ill.1999)  
27 (ordering defendants to process plaintiffs’ applications; noting that application had  
28

1        been pending for two years, that plaintiff were “the victims of a bureaucratic  
2        nightmare,” and that the delay was largely attributable to the government’s  
3        “misfeasance”); *Jefrey v. INS*, 710 F.Supp. 486 (S.D.N.Y.1989) (delay of 16 months  
4        unreasonable); *Dabone*, 734 F.Supp. at 202 (delay of 20 months unreasonable); *Yu*,  
5        36 F.Supp.2d at 932 (delay of two and a half years a prima facie case  
6        unreasonableness). *Agbemape v. INS*, No. 97 C 8547, 1998 WL 292441, at \*2 (N.D.  
7        Ill. May 18, 1998) (finding dismissal inappropriate because a 20-month delay could  
8        be found to be unreasonable and holding as a matter of law that plaintiff “is entitled to  
9        a decision within a reasonable time, and that it is within the power of the court to  
10       order such an adjudication”). *Song v. Klapakas*, No.06-05589 (E.D. Penn. April 12,  
11       2007) (finding dismissal improper and a 23-month delay unreasonable). *Razik*, 2003  
12       U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13818, at \*5-8 (denying respondents’ motion to dismiss the  
13       petitioner’s case; noting that applications had languished for two years and yet the  
14       INS has done nothing”). *Cf. Galvez v. Howerton*, 503 F. Supp. 35, 39-40 (C.D. Cal.  
15       1980) (finding that the INS engaged in affirmative misconduct in processing petitions  
16       for adjustment of status and that therefore defendants were estopped from denying the  
17       plaintiffs permanent resident status; noting that one example of affirmative  
18       misconduct was a six-month delay by defendants in processing). *Singh v. Still*, No. C  
19       06-2458 (N.D. Ca. Jan. 8, 2006) (finding a near four year delay unreasonable and  
20       ordering processing of application “forthwith”). *Elkhatib v. Bulter*, No. 04-22407  
21       (S.D. Fl. Jun 6, 2005) (finding a four year delay unreasonable). Petitioner also notes  
22       that the CSC’s posted processing time for an I-485 is approximately six months. In  
23       fact, Petitioner’s husband Zhenru Ding, the principal applicant, applied for adjustment  
24       of status on April 19, 2004. His application was approved and he became a

1 permanent resident on January 19, 2005. On the other hand, the Petitioner's  
2 application, which was submitted with her husband's application on the same day,  
3 still remains pending.

4 Respondents' failure to adjudicate Petitioner's application for permanent  
5 residency has resulted in Petitioner remaining for years in the United States in limbo  
6 status. The failure to adjudicate the application also continues to delay Petitioner's  
7 ability to become United States Citizen.  
8

#### 9 **IV. CONCLUSION**

10 Respondents owe a duty to adjudicate Petitioner's application for permanent  
11 residency and to do so within a reasonable period of time. Respondents have clearly  
12 violated this duty. As Petitioner's application has been pending long beyond a  
13 reasonable period of time, the Court should conclude that summary judgment in favor  
14 of Petitioner is warranted and order that Respondents adjudicate her application  
15 within 10 days of this Court's order granting her motion for summary judgment. An  
16 immigrant visa number was previously continuously available and is currently still  
17 available for Petitioner's priority date of December 21, 2001 and employment  
18 classification (EB-2 Mainland China). Given the present extraordinary  
19 circumstances, should an immigrant visa number ever becomes unavailable to  
20 Petitioner in the future due to visa retrogression, Petitioner requests that the Court  
21 order Defendants to complete adjudication of her I-485 application within 30 days of  
22 an immigrant visa number becoming available to her and retains jurisdiction over this  
23 matter until Defendants have concluded adjudication.

24 In addition, Petitioner prays that the Court grant such other relief that may be  
25 just and appropriate, including costs, expenses, and reasonable attorney's fees  
26 pursuant to Equal Access to Justice Act, 28 U.S.C. §2412 (1991).  
27  
28

1 Dated: March 3, 2008

2 Respectfully submitted,

3

4

\_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
Tricia Wang  
Attorney for the Petitioner

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28